



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/182,911
Filing Date	10/30/1998
First Named Inventor	Barry G. Wilks
Art Unit	2674
Examiner Name	Jean E. Lesperance
Attorney Docket Number	0100.9800830

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2004

Technology Center 2000

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached | <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition | <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> After Final | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application | <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation | <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer | -return postcard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement | <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application | Remarks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | | |

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm
or
Individual name

Christopher J. Reckamp

Signature

Date

May 24, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name

Christine A. Wright

Signature

Date

May 24, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Barry G. Wilks
Serial No.: 09/182,911
Filing Date: October 30, 1998
Confirmation No. 2532

Examiner: Jean E. Lesperance
Art Group: 2674
Our File No.: 00100.98.1269
Docket No.: 0100.9800830

34/leg for
Reconsid
6-3-04
RECEIVED

JUN 01 2004

Technology Center 2600

Title: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR SUPPORTING MULTIPLE DISPLAYS**

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this date.

5-24-04
Date

Christine A. Wright
Christine A. Wright

AFTER FINAL RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated March 24, 2004, Applicant responds as follows:

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 13-18 and 29 are allowed.

Applicant also respectfully submits that additional allowable subject matter is present in the claims as they currently stand since it appears that the cited references may have been misunderstood. For example, Applicant claims a method for supporting multiple displays per drawing surface. As such, a drawing surface such as that stored in the frame buffer or portions thereof are output to multiple displays and the multiple display output is supported in a particular fashion as claimed by Applicant for example in claim 4. The cited Zenda reference does not contemplate per drawing surface output on multiple displays and to the contrary teaches a single

display system. As noted specifically in Zenda, in the Summary of the Invention section, Zenda states that the display Zenda is referring to is a plasma display that has different displaying mode for the single display and utilizes different display resolutions “in a single plasma display apparatus” (see column 1, lines 45-46 (emphasis added)). In fact, the Zenda reference attempts to overcome the problem where many application programs have been written for cathode ray tube displays. If a plasma display is connected instead of (and not in addition to) a CRT, the display on the plasma may not be suitable as there are non-used areas. (Column 1, lines 31-39). As such, Zenda cannot and does not contemplate supporting multiple displays per drawing surface. Zenda only supports a single display. For example, Zenda only supports output of a drawing surface on a single display, not multiple displays as required by the claim. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance for this reason alone.

Similarly, the Kotha reference is also directed to a single display output system. As such, even combining the two references would not result in a method or apparatus for supporting multiple displays per drawing surface as claimed.

In addition, in the “Response to Argument” section the office action states that the Examiner disagrees with Applicant’s prior arguments and cites “AND gate 41” in column 4, lines 20-23. However, Applicant believes that there may be a typographical error as there does not appear to be AND gate 41. Also column 4, lines 20-23 state that the CRT control converts display data into four levels for display for plasma display. Applicant is not claiming any color conversion as part of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider Applicant’s previous and current remarks in view of the Zenda reference and claim language. The Examiner indicated that Applicant has to further amend the claims to be more specific in order to overcome the prior art of record. However, Applicant respectfully submits


that the claims cannot be read in a vacuum and must be read, pursuant to controlling case law, in view of the specification. Meaning must be given to words in the claims that would be attributed by one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the specification. As noted above, the method and apparatus of Applicant's invention is directed to supporting multiple displays per drawing surface. As stated in the specification, multiple displays per drawing surface require output of a drawing surface on multiple displays during the operation of the system. The claim language also claims the multiple displays per drawing surface by requiring for example the receipt of display capability parameters of a first display "of the multiple displays"; these multiple displays support one common drawing surface. Accordingly, the multiple displays per drawing surface are not only in the preamble but also in the body of the claim as such the claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant also respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made in the previous office action.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 24, 2004

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005